DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 859 PS 007 299

AUTHOR Faragher, John; And Others
TITLE Parent Cooperative Group Child Care.
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 58p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Child Rearing; Community Cooperation; *Cooperative Planning; *Cooperative Programs; *Day Care Programs; Family (Sociological Unit); Group Structure; *Parent Participation; Parent Role; Program Descriptions; *Role Conflict; Role Perception

ABSTRACT

A model for cooperative day care is proposed which aims to protect the beneficial aspects of the child rearing relations of the nuclear family by substituting a caring group of parents for the caring solitary parent. Early child care in the nuclear family provides a secure wholistic relationship between mother and child, but it also sets that relationship in the context of roles which alienate family members from each other. There may be an inevitable relationship between real long term solutions to the growing child care crisis and a restructuring of the now accepted sexual division of labor. Described are some of the issues and problems involved in the creation of the State Street Center parent cooperative in New Haven, Connecticut. Included is a discussion of the theoretical foundations of the program, emphasizing some of the areas in which group care in a cooperating community alters the child care environment. (CS)

MAY 24 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 094859

PS 007299

ABSTRACT

PARENT COOPERATIVE GROUP CHILD CARE

John Faragher, Bertram E. Garskof & Michele Hoffnung

Early childcare in the nuclear family provides on the one hand a secure wholistic relationship between mother and child and on the other hand sets that relationship in the context of roles which alienate family members from each other. Professional day care allows mothers to step outside the confining maternal role but replaces wholistic relations with contractual ones between professionals and families. Cooperative day care is an institutional form which can protect what is beneficial in the childrearing relations of the nuclear family by substituting a caring group of parents for the caring solitary parent. Yet it transcends the families' frustrations and limitations by providing a caring adult environment divested of the alienation and social isolation found in traditional social roles. A model for cooperative childcare is proposed which suggests its applicability to a broad range of social groupings. The implications of large scale reordering of the assignment of social reproduction are examined. It is suggested that there is an inevitable relationship between real long term solutions to the growing childcare crisis and restructuring of the now accepted sexual division of labor.

****

PARENT COOPERATIVE GROUP CHILD CARE

John Faragher, Bertram E. Garskof & Michele Hoffnung

Quinnipiac College
Hamden, Connecticut

****

PARENT COOPERATIVE GROUP CHILD CARE

John Faragher, Bertram E. Garskof & Michele Hoffnung[1]

Quinnipiac College
Hamden, Connecticut

Introduction

In the USA, opinions about child care stress the primacy of the privatized nuclear family. Most Americans believe that the best, perhaps the only acceptable format for the raising of healthy children is the private world of the family. As family structure within the U.S. is changing from the extended form found frequently in pre-capitalist or non-industrial society, more and more families raise children, especially young children, under the exclusive reign of the housewife-mother. At this same juncture, more of these young mothers are impelled to seek full-time employment. The combination of the strong belief in family-centered child care, the decline of a more supportive family-community structure, and the set of needs driving women into the labor force combine to presage a child-care crisis in our society. There are already some indications of this crisis. The rise in child abuse is perhaps the most frightening of these (Heider, 1971).

[1] Authors listed alphabetically

Another is the contradictory manner in which public professional group care surfaces as a political issue. Funds are won arduously, the amounts are never adequate, and then funds are withdrawn as the forces which hold to the family model find political expression. Thus, publicly supported group care has not grown significantly, either in size or quality.

Meanwhile, working mothers find solutions to their need for child care by replicating as closely as possible the nuclear setting (Children's Bureau, 1968). Most working mothers of pre-school age children find a surrogate to watch the children, usually in the mother's home but often in the substitute's home. The surrogate is usually a relative or paid older woman.

In fact, there is no institutional format which is widely acceptable at this time. Professional or public group day care is a rare and ill-favored option for most parents because it does not conform to the values people commonly hold concerning the proper role of the family in child care and because it is relatively unavailable. Private group care, as a small business, is rare and costly to the parents and corporate interest in group child care is on the wane after exploratory projects proved unprofitable (Corporations and Child Care, Undated).

We have been working for several years developing a theory and practice of a little-used institutional alternative: <u>parent cooperative group</u> child care. We believe that this approach offers a resolution to the contradictory set of forces at work. In this

paper we explore the historical and social dynamics which suggest cooperative child care as a solution. Then, we describe in some detail the structure of one parent cooperative and analyze the nature of the interaction between the temporal requirements of cooperative child care and the temporal resources of various communities. Finally we suggest, briefly, some considerations which are relevant to the development of a strategy for the creation of cooperative day care on a broad scale in the USA.

I. The study of approaches to social reproduction reveals a wide variety of early child-care arrangements (Blumberg & Winch, 1972). The agent of primary socialization in modern Western society--the nuclear family -- is only one of several family forms in the context of historic world cultures. The nuclear unit, on the one hand, has been adaptable to the requisite occupational and geographic mobility of modern society, while at the same time it has retained the emotional comfort and stability of close personal relations in an increasingly alien world. Consequently, among those sectors of the population most highly urbanized and affected by the social relations of modern capitalism, the nuclear family has been the ascendant familial form. The nuclear family was an emerging institution among the English prior to their immigration to North America in the seventeenth century. Waves of European, Mexican, Carribbean, and rural Black immigration re-introduced pre-modern peasant family traditions into American life, but as these peoples have been forced into the mold of modern social

relations, they too have joined older Anglo-Americans in adopting the nuclear family form (Parsons, 1955; Ames, 1962; Gutman, 1973).

Unlike the extended family, in which the responsiblilities of child rearing were shared among close relatives and close neighbors, the idealized nuclear family provides for no sharing of this responsibility. Within the nuclear family, parental responsibility has devolved exclusively and unremittingly upon the single woman in the household, in spite of a consistent trend, over the past hundred years, toward increasing maternal outside employment (Women's Bureau, 1969). Informal organs such as women's magazines and soap operas as well as serious works in psychological and sociological and historical literature (Deutsch, 1945; Bardwick, 1971; Smith, 1970) often present this form of child care as an instinctive, natural, and fulfilling lifestyle for a woman. Not only has it become folklore that the single woman-child relationship is instinctive, but it is now widely believed to be an especially good one for children.

Of course, no one extant or historic child-rearing arrangement can be shown by the mere fact of its existence to be more normal or natural than any other. There is no evidence in ethnology, child psychology, or history to suggest that the exclusive one-to-one mother-child dyad is any more likely to lead to satisfied mothers or happy children than many other possible arrangements. In fact, there is considerable evidence to the contrary (McBride, 1973). To believe otherwise is to consign much of the history of our species, up to the development of the modern family, to supposed unnatural frustration.

Within the nuclear family, motherhood represents the raising to dominance of the role of child-bearer and child-rearer above all other aspects of woman's being. The mother is made the slave, if not of the child, at least of the concept of motherhood. The submergence of other areas of fulfillment into one particular socially-determined role, is, of necessity, thwarting of many potentially meaningful activities. Indeed, the submergence of woman's being into the role of mother, as it is defined in the nuclear family, is particularly limiting and degrading. Although time spent with children can be rewarding, when that time represents the preponderance of day-to-day interactions and a person's sole productive activity, these interactions become frustrating rather than rewarding. Further, motherhood, while extolled for its virtues and glories, is, in a society which defines worth monetarily, unpaid labor. The mother is caught between her economic dependence upon her mate and the total dependence of her charges. Incompletely adult in the terms of society, since she does not work for monetary compensation, she must nevertheless struggle to create adults. The resulting inevitable frustrations are well documented in the literature (Brazelton, 1963; Gordon and Gordon, 1960).

Yet, child rearing within the nuclear family is said to be best for children because it provides, as does no other form, consistency. If it was possible for the nucleated mother to feel good about herself, she could provide a kind of day-to-day consistency. But the mother's frustrations are frequently transmitted to the children in a variety of destructive ways.

PS 007299

Moreover, while it is true that children need consistency of love, of routines, of expectations (although probably not as much as we who were raised in nuclear families believe they need), we have been blinded by the prevailing ideology of motherhood not to see that we have come to use the concept of consistency to mean, quite tautologically, nothing more than mothering in the nuclear family. Consistent is not a synonym for sole but for regular. And we also forget that children flourish with variety and diversity as well as regularity. Perhaps most importantly, we have forgotten that regularity can be provided by multiple adults in group care settings.

The motherhood-mystique has emerged as the dominant ideology of woman's place quite recently, at the same historic moment when masses of women, along with men, were moving from a family to a market economy. Although the new ideology was the culmination of a long series of interacting trends in societal and family relations, the idea of motherhood, along with the new ideas of the family as a sanctuary from the troubled world, were in part a response to the necessity of preserving the family as one of the few social institutions which incorporated intimate interpersonal relationships as an integral part of its structure. As a consequence of the fact that women were relatively less employed, less well-trained, and less well-paid than men in the economy, the burden of preserving the crucial family unit fell upon them.

Since the nineteenth century, however, women have steadily increased their total proportion in the labor force. Today, with women composing over forty percent of the working population, and

with the numbers of working women continually growing, the contradiction between women in the economy and the concept of motherhood has become profound. Working mothers with pre-school children are forced to deviate from the expected familial model, and resort to private alternatives such as combinations of friends and relatives, or paid sitters in the home to provide essential daycare. Although most working mothers seem to find surrogate care, and although most report satisfaction with the alternatives available (Children's Bureau, 1968), little is known about the possible conflicts inherent in this wide-spread phenomenon. Do mothers feel that they or their husbands are inadequate because they must work and "abandon" their children? (See Brazelton, 1963 for analysis of role conflict.) Do children have difficulty dealing with the existence of two dominant figures in the two worlds of private care: day surrogate mother and night mother? And we have no way of assessing the numbers of mothers who would benefit financially and/or psychologically by outside employment, but who cannot seek such work for fear of the guilt and disapproval involved.

However, continuing rapid increases in the number of working mothers has resulted in some societal pressures for institutional daycare options. In some factories, for example, pressure from women workers has resulted in the establishment of daycare centers for their children (KLH, 1967). Growing public opposition to welfare costs has led to the development of programs designed to move women from welfare assistance to employment, with daycare as a critical concommitant.

But despite this combination of increasing maternal employment and increased governmental interest in professional group daycare for certain sectors of the population, necessary attitudinal changes on the part of opinion-leaders such as doctors, politicians and social workers have not yet been sufficient to lead to any appreciable modifications of the general view that group daycare is somehow a less respectable option than individual mothering. This concept of motherhood is too pervasive to be swept aside by the rising tide of woman's employment. The social reluctance to violate the cannons of modern familial theory is at least as strong among social planners as among mothers. Even daycare reformers attempting to recruit others to the battle for improved daycare operate with and reinforce this bias in favor of the nuclear family.

In sum, the child-care picture with regard to the early years of childhood includes the following factors: 1) there is widespread belief that individual private care is best, 2) mothers who must or choose to work find an alternative which most closely matches individual private mothering, 3) the remaining mothers of young children are not impelled by economic pressures and/or are too committed to the role of housewife-mother to seek outside employment, 4) not enough thought is given to the possible negative factors implicit in nuclear mothering, and 5) for the above and other reasons there is not now a growing movement for an institutional group care alternative to private child care.

II. We have been discussing the family in terms of its functions in socialization. As indicated, people also see the family as home base, the place where material and psychological nourishment are taken. One learns from earliest childhood to expect love and unswerving commitment inside the family, fleeting, uncommitted, uncaring relationships in society at large. Even if, in practice, family love is frought with complications, family responsibility erratically met, our place of belonging inside the family provides us with our primary source of security against the outside world.

This inside/outside dichotomy matches the traditional sociological distinction between Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft (Toennies,1957). Gemeinschaft describes a social nexus in which people relate with their whole beings rather than within limited contractual roles. Tribal and, to an extent, even feudal societies were organized around the full potential of human interaction, interaction which served functional purposes as a consequence of the human contact. Individual human beings were embedded in a web of personal relations with others through the family, clan, tribe, totem, the home, manor and church, which extended human relationships to an ever-widening group of people. In theory, such wholistic relationships exist in our society in what are described as the love-oriented situations of bride-groom, mother-child, brother-sister, all of which can be subsumed under the more general heading of family relationships.

Over the past few centuries the movement from agrarian to modern society has involved the replacement of non-nuclear family relationships with interactions defined in a contractual sense. Outside of the nuclear family human relationships became the

interaction between socially-prescribed roles rather than those between whole human beings; as, for example, the contractual arrangements of customer-salesman, student-teacher, patient-physician. Each of these partial relationships is defined by a contract, a set of role expectations which does not allow deep understanding and commitment to develop. The sum total of one's day-to-day interactions within one's roles is the person. In Gesellschaft society, one is one's roles.

It is also true, however, that Gemeinschaft forms persist within the most rigid Gesellschaft organization; there is a tendency toward a full human interaction in every Gesellschaft association. Informal, more wholistic, non-role defined relationships are embedded within the formal structure of organized society. These informal associations are often the glue which holds together otherwise alienated groups (Thompson, 1965). Sometimes Gemeinschaft forms co-exist with formal relationships, sometimes they are latent. When a disaster strikes a suburban community, heretofore estranged and suspicious neighbors share food and shelter with unfortunate victims. A Gemeinschaft form quickly springs into being, to disappear just as quickly when things return to normal. Thus, belief in socialization of Gesellschaft behavior without contradiction is not sufficient to account for the persistence of and re-occurence of Gemeinschaft behavior within our society.

How do we explain the tendency for Gemeinschaft to emerge in the face of strong cultural conditioning to the contrary? The tendency toward loving and co-operative behavior is part of the

behavioral-genetic makeup of our particular species. In his clinical work, Reich (1972) discovered, beneath the Freudian unconscious, natural sociality, and sexuality, spontaneous enjoyment of work, and capacity for love. When, as has occurred in the development of our society, the socialization process ignores or distorts these tendencies in its production of adults who conform to the demands of the social structure, repression, frustration and alienation result. People need social structures which allow for the actualization of their potential for Gemeinschaft behavior. But, the thwarting of the potential for natural sociality does not destroy it. Gemeinschaft can and does emerge; the need for close, full human relations is present even within the role-structured relations of a rigid corporate structure.

Montagu (1970) explains the existence of these inborn behavioral potentials by connecting their presence to the conditions under which our species struggled to survive. Our primate ancestors were forced from an arboreal to a grassland existence. In that new environment, a lifestyle with physical and behavioral concomitants developed that put a premium upon cooperation and dedication to the mutual survival of the group. What we have here described as Gemeinschaft behavior was passed down to us through a process of natural selection.

Thus, we argue, we are born with the need for and the potential to participate in close, cooperative groups. These tendencies,

even when repressed, remain latent and, by virtue of their blocked expression, provide a source of dissatisfaction and tension. This tension may remain, unable to be altered, or people may find social situations which, even in the face of the prevailing acceptability of Gesellschaft institutions, create the possibility for relating on more complete and more cooperative bases.

The nuclear family, the kernel of what was once a whole social web of Gemeinschaft relationships, remains as the last outpost of wholistic love in our society. The nuclear family is by definition a cooperating, loving, social unit, one of whose main responsibilities is the reproduction of the next generation. It is, however, a troubled institution, hardly ever, in practice, a bastion of unselfish love and mutual well-being. It is often a tension-filled set of interactions, as expressive of hate as of love. The endemic power and status characteristics of the family, reified in the concepts of motherhood and male responsibility and authority, largely prevent the task of social reproduction from being a cooperative, mutually rewarding task. The division of labor within the family replicates the division between the family and society itself, separating social reproduction from other life-and society-supporting functions. Separated from the inter-connections of human life, the process of child-rearing is gloriously mystified on the one hand, trivialized on the other. Originating as a Gemeinschaft association, predicated upon principles of full human interaction, the family itself has taken on some aspects

of a Gesellschaft institution.

In this context we can see that professional group daycare provides no options for resolving this contradiction, but, on the contrary, operates to further limit the possibility for the expression of full human potential. Professional centers embody, in essence, a set of contractual relationships between a group of unrelated families, each of which partially relinquishes its child-care functions to a set of professional strangers, who agree to perform those functions. The motherhood role, with its lack of status and power, is taken over by the child-care worker, who serves as paid maternal surrogate. The potential of the all-encompassing positive relationship of parent to child is sacrificed to the establishment of simply one more contractual association. Although the need for group daycare is both valid and acute, professional daycare plus nuclear nightcare can only ameliorate the tension within the nuclear family. It cannot transcend the family's endemic duress. We are asserting that much of the reluctance to public daycare is based on the well-founded fear that this final bit of community will be commercialized.

III. The model to be discussed in the following sections - parent cooperative group daycare - is an attempt to resolve these contradictions. A parent cooperative associates a group of nuclear families to share social-reproductive functions. It replaces the individual nuclear family with a wider community as the agent for the socialization of the children. Since parents do not relinquish child rearing to a staff that contracts to perform surrogate work, cooperative daycare presents the possibility of meeting the human need for Gemeinschaft, for cooperative relations in social repro-

duction, while relieving the stress brought about by the solitary child care of the nuclear family. Also, not insignificantly since people who participate in the center take turns staffing the center without financial remuneration, cooperative daycare is very inexpensive to operate.

We will now take up some of the issues and problems involved in the creation of one parent cooperative, the State Street Center in New Haven, Connecticut. This will provide a focus for what will follow: the more general discussion of organizing cooperative child care as a societal option.

The State Street Center (SSC) is a modified parent cooperative currently serving 35 children from 5 months to 5 years in age, operating from 8:30-5:00, Monday thru Friday. Basic parental responsibilities include turns (½ day) with the children, tuition, weekly clean-up, and food buying and preparation. The operating budget is generated exclusively from family tuition. Each family pays 8% of its gross income to enroll one child. Each additional child enrolled in the center costs an additional 4% of the family's gross income. Families whose income is more than $15,500 pay only 8% of $15,000. Table 1 indicates SSC's operating budget. It can be seen that the major item is rent, representing 50% of the budget.

Table 1 -- State Street Center -- Monthly Budget

1. Rent	$750
2. Food	350
3. Equipment	100
4. Program Supplies	100
5. Cleaning Supplies	75
6. Loan Payment	100
7. Phone	25
Total	$1,500

Although the space is pleasant and large enough for the program, the cost is high. Stringent licensing procedures and restrictive building and fire codes forced SSC into commercially rentable space rather than cheaper private housing perfectly compatable with the operation of such cooperatives. It is noteworthy that even with the unusually high rent figure, daycare in a cooperative center can still be provided for a range of families at an average cost or $43/child/month.

This figure is in striking contrast with government guidelines that suggest a figure of $40/child/week as necessary to provide quality daycare. Other budget items include more than adequate amounts for supplies, equipment and three snacks and lunch daily. Food at a representative Head Start Center is budgeted at 50¢/person/day. SSC's food budget approximates that but does not include, on other lines, salary items for cooks and nutrition consultant personnel, items to be found in government or private non-coop center budgets. It is not unusual to find that as much as eighty per cent of a daycare center's general budget is assigned to wages and fringe benefits to employees. In contrast, major items in a cooperative's budget are rent, food, supplies and equipment. All told, cooperative costs ought to hold at around $40/child/month.

SSC has adopted a parent buy-out option which allows parents who do not or cannot take turns to pay money into the center for the turns not done. Each turn not done costs the parent $8.00. Parents are abliged to work out a relatively permanent arrangement for turns.

Some families buy out all three of their weekly obligatory turns, others do two and buy one, etc. The number of bought out parent turns fluctuates.

We were members of a collective of parent organizers who began SSC in April of 1972. The plan for the new center grew out of our experiences in several other parent cooperatives. These earlier centers, while providing safe and adequate care for the children were inadequately structured, so that the development and improvement of program philosophy and program were made difficult. Stressing full participation and democratic control, these centers attempted to implement a child care community without authoritarian, professional direction. But consensus among adults was necessary to implement any but the most minor program issues. These centers floundered on the issues of power and decision making.

The face-to-face consensus cooperatives which preceded SSC went down two paths. Some, unable to reach consensus on broad issues, self-destructed. Others still exist by virtue of a set of decisions to avoid struggling around issues likely to seriously divide parents. These decisions resulted in survival with limited program development.

We were struggling with these problems when we began the new center. We thought that most important was the modification of the full cooperative model so that a cohesive philosophy and program could be created in the context of a non-professional center. Initially, we organizers formed ourselves into a steering committee which operated the center. Families who joined were not

automatically included in this decision-making body controlling the budget, scheduling and other administrative responsibilities. The steering committee worked, as a supraordinate body, with new parents on philosophic and program issues.

Another modification of the full cooperative model was the creation of the "buyout" option for turns. The general cooperative model simply says that child-care aspects of social reproduction ought to be the responsibility of the whole present generation. A pure cooperative where all of the actual parents must staff the center and all of the center staff is made up of the children's parents, is only one form of the general model for cooperatives. Still others might include cooperatives in which no parents, but rather other non-parent community members staffed the center, or centers that used a mix of parents and non-parents.

We decided to allow parents to buy out some or all of their turns. This has had salutory effects. Women whose husbands can't or won't do turns still may join. Also, women who are abandoning the role of solitary mother often need to return to school, find jobs, or otherwise disengage from the tasks of child care. The buy-out option provides an opportunity to test out new roles and responsibilities for these women.

The steering committee created two mechanisms for implementing program decisions and testing program ideas. Rather than spreading the money from turn buy-outs among several adults, the money was allocated to only three people. Each of these half-time co-ordinators was included in the decision-making structure, giving the steering committee on-the-floor turns with which to shape

and monitor the development of program more effectively. One of the organizers also teaches a field work course at nearby Quinnipiac College, and students were placed for work in the Center, greatly easing the squeeze on parents for turns and granting even further flexibility for program development by the steering committee.

Although overall direction to the program was provided by the steering committee, program planning was facilitated in two additional settings: age-group program committees and student program meetings. Each of the program committees, meeting weekly, included steering committee members functioning as organizers, some parents, and some especially interested students. Each week's field-work class devoted at least one hour to program discussion. These latter discussions were open to any parent and a few parents attended these classes regularly. Between steering committee, program committee and class meetings, perhaps fourteen hours per week have regularly been put into formal meetings devoted to program development. This has been augmented by student supervision, informal discussions, phone calls, etc.

This growing structure of participation was directed by the steering committee. By no means was the development toward the present situation lacking in conflict. Parents consistently struggled against what they perceived as undemocratic control from the steering committee. In return we argued that decision making needed to be comensurate with commitment to a collective, on-going process of program development, that any parent, student or volunteer who accepted this responsibility could join, but that membership in the center ought not to require this commitment from those

who were too busy in their own work to participate. Out of this tension emerged the pattern of development: increasing numbers of parents taking on such collective responsibility, the steering committee encouraging and organizing for such responsibility and gradually working to put itself out of business.

Over the past two years the decision-making committee has grown from the original four organizers to include some twenty people out of a total adult community of nearly fifty. Each of the twenty has committed his/herself to a collective style of work on the broad program committees and has taken on additional work in various smaller committees running specialized aspects of the center, working (as organizers) with some additional number of parents. All told, over half of the adult community has become involved, many substantively, in program development, through the development of a collective and disciplined committee structure.

IV. Since the basis of a cooperative is the substitution of volunteer time for employed staff, it is instructive to analyize the time used to operate SSC. There are three main time categories in what might be called a cooperative time budget: on duty time with the children, maintainance time, and planning time. The first of these, adult time spent with the children, is determined by several factors: the characterof the space, equipment and supplies, and group commitment to program excellence, for example, in cognitive learning or other enrichment programs. At SSC our

dominant concern was the inexperience of our staff and the large, shifting number of adults doing turns. Consequently we set the adult/child ratio at 1/3. This, in comparison to ratios set by government or private centers, provides an unusually high number of adult staff members. For example, Flax (1973) found, in a study of twenty New Haven area daycare centers, that adult/child ratios averaged 1/7 and ran as high as 1/12. The typically low ratios of professional centers and higher ratios possible at cooperatives such as SSC create dramatic differences in the social settings at each kind of center. Low ratios lead to a school-like setting while high ratios help create a more communal atmosphere with small groupings and higher tolerance for free flowing activities. As the program at SSC has become more defined and as parents have become more attuned to program, the ratio has been allowed to shift somewhat. At present, the older child program (4-5 year olds) is staffed at a ratio of 1/4, the middle age group (3-4 year olds) is staffed at 1/3, while the baby program (up to 3 year olds) operates at an even higher ratio of 1/2.

These ratios, in combination with the number of children currently enrolled in each age grouping sum to a total of 9 adults on duty during each turn. This staff does 90 turns of 4 hour duration each per week. The total adult time put in on duty at the Center, then, amounts to 360 hours per week.

Any cooperative has many options in establishing a staff ratio and of filling the on-duty time required. Some might draw

more heavily on the time of non-working mothers while excusing working mothers and fathers from participation; some centers might ask fathers to use lunch hours to help staff the centers, some might seek high school or college students to fill in, etc.

The major maintainance work at SSC consists of weekly clean-up and weekly menu planning and food buying. Clean-up is assigned to all parents on a rotating basis with four parents assigned to each week-end clean-up. The work session usually takes five hours, a total of twenty person-hours. Menu planning and food buying, assigned in a similar manner, take eight person-hours per week.

Program planning and staff training to implement program plans procede as follows: each age group program committee meets weekly for meetings which average three and a half hours each (at present, person hours = 70); the daycare class meets once per week for a 3-hour class, every class addresses some aspect of child care but each week at least the first hour is spent discussing program specifics (at present, counting students and staff, person hours = 20); each student is supervised in individual sessions by the center coordinators for ½ hour sessions weekly (person hours = 22½). There is no way of tabulating other more informal media for program discussions which occur in the life of the center such as phone calls between parents preparing a project, discussions after turns, etc.

There are several areas of necessary work which are done by members of the steering committee, but not during meetings. Notable among these is scheduling, a major task in a cooperative

because of the large and complex set of needs which must be taken into account in making up the weekly schedule. At present two people perform this function, spending an average of two hours per week doing the schedule and adjusting it as changes are required. A second vital function shared by two people is the handling of the center's finances. This task takes approximately three person hours per week to keep track of and record the financial transactions of the center. There are many other sporadically assigned functions which are also performed by members of the steering committee or assigned to other parents, such as supply ordering, procurement of space, organizing of trips, etc. Table 2 enumerates the time involved in all the areas of SSC's functioning.

Table 2 -- Time Necessary for the Operation of State Street Center *

Work Category	
1. Day Care turns	360
2. Maintainance	28
A. Clean up	20
B. Food Buying & Preparation	8
3. Program Planning and Staff Training	127½
A. Age-group Programs	70
B. Day Care Classes	20
C. Student Supervision	10
D. Daily Meetings	22½
E. Scheduling & Finances	5
Total	520½

*Since membership on all committees fluctuates, Table 2 is a current representation of operating time at this cooperative.

It is difficult to interpret the seemingly large number of person hours put into program at SSC since this committee work is notoriously inefficient. Smaller professional staffs might well be able to accomplish the same work in fewer hours. But we remain convinced that a cooperative center can reproduce or better a professional staff's capacity for program development with this sort of committee work.

In summary, the time necessary to operate the State Street Center ranges somewhere between 500 to 550 person/hours per week. About 70% of this time is time with the children with the remainder put in weekly to operate SSC and in planning and staff development.

We cannot assert that the amount of time used at SSC, where the organizers have been consciously working to combine the cooperative model with excellence in program, is typical. Most cooperatives would likely be run by less experienced people who would be more concerned with minimizing time commitment and less concerned with program quality. Organizers would more likely have to indirectly influence the structure and program of a new cooperative, rather than creating a committee structure through which to organize. Consequently, the time input requirements of SSC can be thought of as an upper limit on the time necessary to operate a cooperative child-care center.

V. Let us talk more generally for a moment. The disposition of an individual's,community's, or society's time is fixed by the

material conditions of life. Specifically, it is the productive organization of the society that most determines time use. There are two general categories of time-use through which families relate to the world of necessary work. The first and most primary is reproductive time, defined broadly as the work of reproducing on a day-to-day and generation-to-generation basis the population necessary for survival. This work includes caring for people's homes, feeding, clothing, resting, reproducing and raising the next generation. The second catagory is time spent in productive activity, or simply the time family members spend working for wages. Productive is used here only to denote that work which is characterized by its nature as productive in the capitalist sense: productive of surplus value. Additionally, distinctions could be made within the category concerning productive labor and non-productive labor: whether wages represent a share of surplus created by the individual's own labor or a doling out by an employer of a share of surplus transferred from other productive labor (Vogel, 1973). We will ignore these otherwise important distinctions here. In this analysis all wage labor will be included within this catagory.

Modern capitalist society has defined human work in these two socially necessary forms, sharply differentiating them, and generally assigning them along sex lines. For all strata of the work force an ideal (ideological) division of labor assumes the assignment of production to the man in the nuclear family and reproduction to the women. This latter assignment tends to hold regardless of the woman's

relation to production; despite the growing percentage of women workers, now nearing 50%, women are still generally responsible for the labor which must go into social reproduction. It is of course true that for the approximately 58 percent of married women who hold jobs (Handbook of Women Workers, 1969) the real, rather than ideal description of time includes both catagories. There is some evidence (Stolz, 1960) that many of the men who live with working wives take on reproductive functions; but even if the husband helps the wife with domestic work, he is helping her with her "rightful" function not accepting responsibility for that function as a man. As Friedan (1963) points out, domestic work is mostly reduced in a dual employment family by less time being devoted to it. The ideal division of labor is a still potent dynamic in the lives of families. If a man can increase his earnings there is a powerful pressure brought to bear upon the wife to abandon her dual role and become a housewife. This desire, coupled with the lack of acceptable child-care arrangements, brings powerful pressure upon the wife to drop-out of the work force and become a housewife. Sexual differential in levels of education and earning capacities support the pressure upon wives to maintain more of the reproductive responsibilities (Vogel, 1971). The sum effect of these pressures conserves the division of traditional labor. It is fair to say, however, that counter-pressures exist in the growing numbers of women who work, in the increasing awareness of women about the oppressive aspects of the role of housewife, and in the growing belief in some notion of an

egalitarian marriage which may presage a change in the division of labor. For now, it is still the case that men living with working women are not picking up as large a share of domestic work as the women add to the family's total wage. As society continues to define the situation, women may help the "bread-winner" and men may help the "little woman" around the house, but in general, society still holds to the division of labor as defined. In this light it is interesting to glance at self-employed businessmen and professionals. These men's time use is largely self-defined but they too accept the sexual division of labor so that although they have it within their power to assign themselves reproductive tasks they usually do not do so.

How is this general feature of our society relevant to this discussion? One major function performed within the general reproductive function is child care, including the daycare of pre-school children. And the place a family holds in the stratified work force determines the real time values placed on the ideal equations which describe the division of labor. Any particular group of women may be studied to reveal the time specifically assigned to child care. Take, for example, an aggregate of women (W_1) who do not work for wages. For these women (assuming that we have chosen for examination women who all have pre-school children) the number of hours put into child care approximately equals the number of child-waking hours. Let us limit the example to the hours which a daycare center might typically operate -- 40 hours a week. For this group the number of total hours spent in child care is simply

the consequence of the privatized conditions in which social-reproductive functions occur in this society; W_1 (N=20), children (N=30), will require 800 person-hours per week in daycare.

Consider another group of women (W_2), each of whom has both a job outside of the home and at least one pre-school child. Total time put into child care by this group during the same hours depends upon the arrangements made by mothers for substitute care. If each mother procures a single baby sitter, replicating the isolated mother, then the total time is the same as W_1. But if some proportion of the mothers place their child(ren) in some form of group care then total time is less than W_1. Group care necessarily means a savings of time for these women.

There are government sponsored survey statistics which enumerate the surrogate options and the proportions of working mothers who choose the various options (Low & Spindler, 1968). These data indicate that full-time working mothers of children under six (a total of 2,561,000 children surveyed) choose overwhelmingly, to substitute other forms of privatized care. Eighty-four percent of the children were cared for in a home setting, 47% in their own homes by relatives or non-relatives, 37% in someone else's home. Adding in other miscellaneous home-bound situations, 92% of the children of working mothers were cared for in home settings. Only 8% of the sample reported children enrolled in group-care centers. These data do not reveal the proportions of home-care settings which include children of more than one mother. Certainly a fairly high proportion include at least more than one sibling. What can, however, be inferred from

these data is that the goal of mothers seeking substitute care is to replicate the family form of child rearing, with an adult/child ratio approaching 1/1.

Let us examine again our hypothetical group whose members have all placed their children in some form of group daycare. The total person hours put into child care would be determined by the staff ratios set by the daycare centers and the time spent by the staffs of the centers in work which supported the functioning of the centers. Using the time analysis of SSC, it would take approximately 525 person-hours per week to care for the 30 children, compared with the 800 hours necessary to care for the same number of children in privatized care by W_1. In this comparison, a 275 hour per week saving in time is accomplished by socializing the privatized child care.

In light of the advantages of the communal as opposed to the professional organization of group care, we would argue that the saving involved in socializing child care should be accomplished in a cooperative fashion. Thus, for groups of women needing child care the consideration of a communal solution forces the inclusion of additional people to the extent that these women are engaged in productive work which monopolizes their time. Who might these people be?

Let's look first at husbands. Men who can find employment do so, and are expected to do so: during working hours men are not responsible for reproductive work, but expected to be working or looking for work. On the other hand, careful observation of the way

men choose to spend their re-creative activities reveals the human situation behind the arbitrary division of labor. Although men by training and role expectations are not supposed to find satisfaction in being with children, many men choose to spend their time allocated to rest and recreation with children: fathers and non-fathers become involved in big brother programs, little league coaching, scouting, and other volunteer work that brings them into contact with child care in addition to supplementary time with their own kids. This is not to argue that the motives which push these men are clear or totally positive. But the division of labor has many alien aspects, one of which is the assertion that nurturant motives are exclusive to female biology. Men are told they have no needs to care for children. The behavior of men as they volunteer to spend free time with kids belies this ideology.

The penchant for men to find satisfaction in relationships with children when opportunities arise, reveals them as a reasonable recruiting group for volunteer labor in the development of socialized child care for groups of working mothers. It is true, of course, that most of the men who volunteer time to care for children do so during non-work time on weekends or evenings. It is possible to make use of such available time in cooperative daycare in several ways. Men might do a variety of building and maintainance projects in the evenings, might open a center evenings or during the weekend hours. Other men in the higher reaches of the work force or self-employed men have the flexibility to schedule one-half day a week working at a center. Both these sources of time have played an

important part in SSC time. It is even conceivable that the demand for day child care time with pay might become an issue in labor negotiations.

Other groupings of non-parents or parent surrogates might have both the time and motivation to become involved in cooperative child care. In any community, non-parents exist whose time commitments are either not yet or no longer fixed by conditions of production. These are often the young and the elderly. The young (under conditions of relatively full employment) gradually enter the work force full-time as they mature. But during adolescence, a time category exists which might be called non-productive time. Young adults typically can neither find full-time employment nor take on the other functions prescribed by the adult world as socially useful. Any examination of youth culture at all strata of our society reveals great amounts of non-productive or wasted time. Many young people are easily persuaded to make their time more productive by sharing communalized social reproduction in cooperative daycare centers. At State Street we have used students in field work. Additionally, we find students staying around semesters after the course, doing volunteer turns, participating in work, even becoming members of the steering committee.

A similar, but reverse, pattern may be observed in our society for the changes in the responsibilities and concomitant time equations of the elderly. Gradually, and then sharply at arbitrary ages, older people are removed by the productive forces from productive re-

sponsibilities and by the family structure from reproductive responsibilities (except where need dictates maternal surrogate roles for grandmothers). Again there is no reason to believe that this considerable resource in both time available and accumulated experience can not be put to use in community cooperative child care, although this is an option we have not worked on at State Street.

Even without altering the time use patterns of society, we do not lack for the people to provide the essential resource to begin cooperative child care facilities for any aggregate of mothers.

VI. Given this conclusion, why have these considerable resources not been put to use to solve "the child care crisis?" How can these resources now be put to such use? How can a mixed group of mothers, fathers, and non-parents be forged into an institution which can provide consistently good child care?

It is necessary to look again at the time use of the group of women before labelled W_1, one made up of housewives exclusively. The decision to come together into a cooperative has already been described as resulting in a possible savings of nearly 35% of the time formerly put into privatized child care for this group. What will they do with this time? Whether each woman is given her proportion of the time saved or whether the time is pooled and given to a sub-set of the women, the immediate question is the use to which this time is put. Obviously, given the organization of our society at present around wage earning in production, most women will

be motivated to seek employment, or schooling so as to be in a better position to seek worthwhile employment. From whence is this employment to come? Of course any particular woman may find work: but projecting this set of events to the societal level, where the question of solutions to the child-care crisis is properly put, it is likely that there would not be work for all of the women freed from child care. Freed of some of the reproductive functions, women are driven, due to economic and psychological self interest, into the job market. This is a market already glutted with males, one that reflects a chronically underutilized productive capacity, one which, except for full scale war production, cannot provide full employment for the present labor force alone. To provide the illusion of tolerable levels of unemployment we must delay adolescent entry and speed up older egress from the work force (Baron & Sweezy, 1966). But our social system does not function in a rational manner. The need for growing numbers of clerical and service workers, in consort with the present ability of capitalists to exploit the wage differentials based on sex-descrimination, has meant that increasing numbers of women are encouraged to enter the job market. Consequently the role model predicated on a clear sexual division of production and reproduction is undergoing change. The simple economic necessity for families to have more wage earnings as well as needs emanating from the psycho-social inadequacies inherent in the division of labor push women to enter the labor force, changing their self-conception and their roles with regard to child care.

It is not within the bounds of this paper to suggest answers to this contradiction. It is possible to see, however, that child-care arrangements will enter into a period of flux and change. Somehow, socialized child care with full male and female participation in both productive and reproductive activities will need to develop. Cooperative child care can be an option in meeting these new conditions. For the more forseeable future, as this crisis deepens such cooperative centers can meet the immediate needs of relatively large numbers of families better and certainly more economically than any other format for daily child care. Since this is so, it is especially important to know that time to create cooperative daycare is available given the present division of labor.

How, then, can parents be helped to create cooperative child care for their children? For any potential cooperative group there exists, a priori, the time resources necessary to begin a cooperative. There are also financial resources available. Cooperatives which make use of existing home settings or which can rent space at costs roughly equivalent to the cost of renting another home site can provide child care for less than the average cost of baby sitters. If the cost is scaled to income there ought to be no group which does not have the minimal financial resources necessary to operate a cooperative.

Without raising the systemic long range question of job availability for women freed of child care, what in fact are the major roadblocks to the initial involvement of parents with the

temporal, and financial resources to begin? They are nearly always attitudinal in nature. Most communities still value privatized child care so much that socialized options, which might solve real familial problems, are rejected out of hand, or, more probably, are not conceptualized at all. A first step, therefore, would seem to be the existence of a community organizing grouping which has that requisite consciousness. This seems to be quite necessary. For example, we once lived in a housing development in close proximity to numerous housewives whose needs for even minimal sharing of daily responsibilities were glaringly apparent but who had not a shread of the consciousness necessary to bring about any movement in that direction. When, as neighbors, we suggested the possibility that watching each others children for brief periods had beneficial effects, several women began to experiment successfully in that way.

An organizing group which set out to develop resources for cooperative child care would, of course, have to study the make-up of a community in terms of the available aggregates of potential child care cooperative staff members. Broadly speaking, either there will be mostly housewife-mothers or working mothers predonimating in particular neighborhoods. There will also be numbers of young people and elderly, and men with free time in some numbers.

There are other factors which work against the societal bias in favor of private care. Mothers need relief or time away from child care, and mothers, as well as surrogates, need to understand child

care better. There is little in the educating of women which prepares them for the job of child-care worker. Mothers have many questions about kids, their needs, their development, which, in the context of privatized child care, go unasked as well as unanswered. These factors are what community organizers have to work with in their initial efforts to sensitize a community to the possibilities in cooperative child care. Housewives need both free time and help in understanding children. Working women need help in understanding children. Youth or the elderly are often present in communities and may be encouraged to participate in the creation of cooperative child care because they come to perceive the effort as satisfying and/or socially useful activity. It is possible that some money would be available for this third grouping through the allocation of community resources or through the transfer of money from mothers now freed to work for wages to the individuals taking on child-care functions. Exactly how the organizers procede depends entirely on the mix of people and other specific characteristics of a community. It may be generally true, however, that groups of housewives are often able to begin to change their functioning gradually through the establishment of play groupings as a transitional step to complete cooperatives. Once a grouping has been established, i.e., once a group of parents have taken on the group care of their children, that mix of people, now better called a cooperative child-care group, must be organized so as to provide safe and consistent care and to discover as a group, principles of group child care in which they come to believe. The

former must be achieved, so as to provide the basis for the latter step. The faults of the nuclear family not withstanding, child care within this structure, at its best, is able to provide a safe and nurturant environment for children. Of course, the contradictions rife in the family structure give these facts a double-edged quality which in the present era must be redressed through deprivatization of child care. But this deprivatization must not be accompanied by a rejection of the potential for safety, and nurturance, and environmental adult input as factors in the development of children. Rather, we must take what is potentially good about the nuclear family and recreate it in a social arena which permits its actualization.

The rejection of presently generally accepted attitudes or values does not take this dialectic into account. Often parents who reject the format of the nuclear family for the raising of children include in this rejection the notion that the actions of parents have any relevancy to the eventual mental and emotional state of their children. To avoid this perhaps natural over-reaction, triggered precisely by the frustrations of the prescribed roles and attitudes, organizers of cooperatives must struggle to preserve what we have learned about the necessity for a safe and thoughtfully prepared environment for children.

This means that the first step in working with people newly committed to cooperative child-care centers around the creation of the basic environment of the center. What is an adequate ratio? What equipment should be scraped up? What safety factors must be

stressed? What needs are the children likely to express and what should be the response of the adults? All of these questions stem from an axiom which must be made explicit, that what the adults do about these questions is important. Baby sitters may not have to consider any or all of these issues because they are watching someone else's children; it is the parents who provide answers to these kinds of questions. A cooperative, it must be learned, is not a holding operation until parents get home, but is an institution instead of the home. People who staff a center which operates for a 40 hour week take on major responsibility for the cognitive, emotional, and social development of the young children who spend the greater part of their waking hours at the center. The data provided by government statistics on the child-care arrangements of working mothers reflect a different value. Most mothers, working or not, re-create the private child-rearing environment. Group care, but as we have argued, only cooperative group care, changes the basic environment for child care.

This paper can only mention some of the areas in which group care by a cooperating community alters the child-care environment and thereby alters the emerging character structures of the children raised in this way. Group care provides a variety of adults, none of whom is dependent upon the children for their basic source of self-worth or identity. This contrasts with private mothering, where a solitary adult figure is very dependent upon the role of mother for the primary source of self-worth and identity.

Because of these differences, children in group care are likely to be more independent, and more inter-dependent with peers than children raised in privatized settings (Johnson & Deisher, 1973; Schwartz, et.al., 1972). In addition, privatized settings, although providing safe and attentive environments do not provide the attending adult with a format for engaging other adults in questions of child development. In contrast, group care by cooperating adults provides an arena for intensive questioning of preconceptions about children and a potential learning experience about children's needs and capacities.

Because of these and other differences, adults who begin to create cooperative child care come quickly into conflict with the inclinations which have been socialized by their own privatized childhood and adult lives. This is to say that cooperatives are learning experiences for adults with tensions and conflicts inevitably arising among adults and between old and newly suggested ways of thinking about children. Organizers of cooperatives can expect these conflicts and must evolve ways of keeping the conflicts within bounds so that child care can continue at the same time the group moves to productive searching for new ideas to match the new situations in which the children are placed. The State Street Center was organized with a structure headed by a powerful, self-selecting steering committee, to accomplish this two-sided task. Recent developments at SSC indicate that parents have come to accept the viability of a centralist structure while at the same time struggling to expand the membership of the decision-making body.

The steering committee structure itself has a tension built into it which in turn created further problems for organizers. As the steering committee becomes inevitably more tuned-in to the issues involved in the creation of group care as well as the every day problems of operating a center, it undertakes a process of discovery which quickly sets it apart from the rest of the adults in the center. This group, more and more aware of what it wants to create, what it must do to fulfill the promise of group child care may leave the rest of the community behind. Yet this same committee's goal is the creation of an adult community who share the responsibilities of cooperative child care. Almost inevitably, then, as a group of rather more than less committed community people come into leadership, they come into conflict with the basic rationale of cooperative child care. SSC's complex committee structure is one attempt to address this contradiction. The steering committee encourages parent participation and has organized a variety of levels of commitment to which non-steering committee people can relate. As people are thus included on more and more decision-making committees,which eventually move to take power from the central structure, this approach opens up leadership to parents and others who become involved in the process of creating cooperative child care without including others who do not in practice show interest or inclinations in that direction. Eventually this process of inclusion/exclusion should bring as many of the adults into the decision making group as is possible.

Finally, it should be apparent that the children and adults who become involved in the process of creating group cooperative child care are altered by the process so that they do not function as privatized adults or children. Child-rearing setting and practice, for any society, is designed to replicate the older generation in the new. Privatized child-care arrangements are the well-nigh perfect arrangements for the creation of atomized adults fit for, if not happy in, the atomized society of bureaucratic capitalism. Thus, inevitably, the child-care cooperative, which by its nature attempts to integrate the conflict between the private and the social, creates people who do not "fit" into the society as it is.

This means that cooperative child care, as sensible as its rationale is in terms of the existing society, is in ultimate conflict with that society. Neither Freudian psychotherapists nor daycare professionals are likely to support efforts to communalize large numbers of children through the establishment of child-care centers. To be an advocate of cooperative child care is to engage these forces in struggle. Each cooperative is living proof of the way people can address both sides of their reproductive problems. Each cooperative and each group of organizers must find ways to involve greater numbers of needy parents and find ways of defending against those who will oppose these efforts.

REFERENCES

American Friends Service Committee; A report by the Corporations and Child Care Research Project. Corporations and child care, work place day care and a look at the alternatives. Undated.

Aries, P. Centuries of childhood: A social history of family life. New York: Knopf, 1962.

Bardwick, J. The psychology of women. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Baron, P., & Sweezy, P. Monopoly capital. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1966.

Blumberg, R. L.,& Winch, R. F. Societal complexity and familial complexity: Evidence for the curvilinear hypothesis. American Journal of Sociology, 1972, 77(5), 898-920.

Brazelton, R. B. The early mother-infant adjustment. Pediatrics, 1963, 32, 931-938.

Children's Bureau. Child care arrangements of working mothers in the United States. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

Deutsch, H. The psychology of women. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1945.

Flax, M. A survey of 20 child care centers: Staffing and children's fighting. Unpublished senior honors thesis, Quinnipiac College, Hamden, Connecticut, 1973.

Freiden, B. The feminine mystique. New York: Norton, 1963.

Gordon, R. E., & Gordon, K. K. The split level trap. New York, 1960.

Gutman, H. Work culture and American capitalism. American Historical Review, 1973.

Heider, G. M. Factors in vulnerability from infancy to later age levels. Vol. 2.Exceptional Infant, J. Helmuth (Ed.), New York: Bruner-Mazel, 1971.

Johnson, C. M., & Deisher, R. W. Contemporary communal child rearing: A first analysis. Pediatrics, 1973, 52, 319-326.

KLH Child Development Center. A proposal to establish a work-related child development center. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1967. Cited by K. Ellis & R. Petchesky, Children of the corporate dream. Socialist Revolution, 9, 1972.

Low, S., & Spindler, P. G. Child care arrangements of working mothers in the United States. Children's Bureau Publication #461, 1968.

McBride, A. The growth and development of mothers. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Montagu, A. The direction of human development. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1970.

Parsons, T. Family socialization and interaction process. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.

Smith, P. Daughters of the promise land. Boston: Little, Brown, 1970.

Thompson, E. P. The making of the English working class. New York: Random House, 1965.

Toennies, F. Community and society. Translator: C. P. Loomis, East Lansing; Michigan State University Press, 1957.

Reich, W. The imposition of sexual morality. In L. Baxandall (Ed.), Sex-pol: Essays 1929-1934. New York, 1972.

Schwartz, J. C., Strickland, R. G., & Krolick, G. A behavioral comparison of early and late starting day care children. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Boston, 1972.

Stoltz, L. M. Effects of maternal employment on children: Evidence from research. Child Development, 1960, 31, 749-782.

Szymanksi, A. Trends in the American working class. Socialist Review, 1972, 8.

Vogel, L. Women workers: Some basic statistics. Boston: New England Free Press, 1971.

Vogel, L. The earthly family. Radical America, 1973, 7(4-5).

Women's Bureau. Handbook of women workers. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

APPENDIX I

EARLY CHILDCARE ARRANGEMENTS: A REVIEW

The prevailing ideology of this society is that each child or set of siblings should and, but for a few exceptions, will be cared for and nurtured by its individual mother. It is generally believed that this unit of mother and child is basic, universal, and the most psychologically sound for the development of the child and the fulfillment of the mother. Theoretical formulations of these popular ideas here come from the psychiatric literature of the last fifty years. Freudianism, arising during the family-centered Victorian era, relies on and supports a family-centered view of the world. This aspect, including the sex role division and the concomitant power inequity and personality stereotypes, has been readily accepted and popularized, while other, more radical, aspects of Freud's original work have almost been entirely forgotten or rejected (see Firestone, 1971).

Researchers who have studied normal children in this and other societies have often argued against the psychiatric viewpoint. Caldwell (1967) has stated that there is no reason to believe that the uninterrupted supervision of a mother is the optimal environment for a child's development, but that other characteristics of the environment determine the value of the growth

experience. Bronfenbrenner (1970) has suggested that exposure to multiple socializing agents fosters self- rather than adult-reliance, making resistance to conformity easier for the child. Mead (1962) has suggested that cultures which provide multiple good mother-figures produce children that are more trusting, more tolerant of separation, and more subtle and complex in their personality characteristics.

It is, therefore, necessary to evaluate the importance of individual mothering for the development of the child. We will examine the psychological research that compares the effects of continual individual mothering with the effects of other, less socially accepted, patterns of child rearing. There are several areas of research that are relevant: the effects of maternal deprivation, the effects of discontinuous or polymatric child-rearing, the effects of working mothers, and the effects of group care. Let us look briefly at each of these.

Individual Alternatives

The work of Bowlby (1951), demonstrating the serious negative effects of maternal deprivation on the physical, cognitive, and social-emotional development of the child, has been taken by some to be support for the psychiatric and cultural value placed upon individual mothering. Disagreement has arisen because of the different possible interpretations of the phrase "maternal deprivation". This has been interpreted to mean anything from lack of constant supervision by the selfless, loving mother, to lack of human stimulation in a hygenic but impersonal institution. Ainsworth (1962) reviewed the existing literature and in accordance with the data defined maternal deprivation to be a condition in

which there was no major mother-figure because one was physically unavailable, because of the mother's inability to relate to the child, or because of the child's inability to relate to the mother. Under these conditions children's cognitive and social-emotional development has been shown to be seriously impaired. The research findings in this area do not, however, shed light on the soundness of the nuclear family model of child rearing as compared to other possible models. They provide evidence that when this model completely collapses, and no other replaces it, the consequences for the child are damaging.

Research done to ascertain the effects of short, cyclical separation from mother, such as daily substitute care, has not demonstrated the damaging effects of maternal deprivation (Caldwell, 1967). Yarrow (1964) has pointed out the difference between maternal deprivation and maternal separation. Although the mother-absent time may be equal, if it is one long separation the effect will be different than if it is regular short separations. This, of course, is counter to the psychiatric view that total time with the mother is the important variable.

The fact that 29 percent of mothers with children under six years of age work and that this percentage has been rising rapidly since 1960 makes it obvious that many families cannot conform to the nuclear family model (Handbook of Women Workers, 1969). Families in which the mother works often choose child care alternatives that are substitute individual mothering arrangements. These include father, grandmother, or some other relative, an individual

baby sitter caring for the child, or the inclusion of the child in some other family. Caldwell et. al. (1963) have labeled these families as "polymatric" since, from the infants' perspective, there are multiple mother-figures. Research on the effects of polymatric childrearing upon the personality development of the child has been extremely limited. Pease and Gardner (1958) have initiated a longitudinal research design for comparing polymatric and monomatric mothering, matching three groups of three-month-olds for age and sex. Their results have not yet been reported. In a retrospective study, however, Gardner, Hawkes, and Burchinal (1961) matched 29 8-17 year olds who lived in a college home management house for three months of their first year and then were adopted with 29 classmates of the same age, sex, intelligence, family size, and socio-economic level. Although one set of personal adjustment scores favored the control Ss, there were no significant differences in adjustment or achievement scores. There was certainly no evidence of glaring and pervasive problems due to the discontinuity in these children's early lives.

Caldwell et. al. (1963) studied the prenatal period and first year of life of children of 35 economically deprived women selected from new patients at a prenatal clinic. The investigators were interested in discovering differences in the infants' personality development associated with monomatric-polymatric status. Infants were considered to be polymatric at six months if this was their condition for two-thirds of the time between three-six months of age, and at one year if so for two-thirds of the time between the

ages of six-twelve months. Prenatal and postnatal interviews, developmental examinations, and behavior observations were made. The differences between the two groups of infants were slight. At six months the polymatric infants were judged to be more irritable. At one year the monomatric infants were judged to be more emotionally dependent upon their mothers and more active. It is possible that some of the polymatric infants may have had stronger emotional relationships with their mother-substitute and were consequently more frightened when accompanied to the clinic by their biological mothers. Larger differences were found between the groups of mothers than between their infants and these were attributable to observed prenatal personality differences.

Stolz (1960) in a review of the effects of maternal employment upon children also suggests that parental personality characteristics might be of crucial importance to the personality development of the children rather than employment-unemployment. She presents evidence that the regularity and degree of satisfaction with maternal employment have significant positive effect upon a working mother's child-rearing interest and ability. Summarizing the findings of all extant studies that meet the requirements of proper controls and social context, Stolz reported no significant relationship between maternal employment and delinquency, adolescent adjustment, high school grades, and dependency behavior in five-year olds. However, since none of these research designs considered the kind of child-care arrangements the results are of but limited value to us in our present concern. We can

safely assume, however, that a greater proportion of working mothers' children were raised in polymatric situations than the children of non-working mothers.

From another perspective, Dewing and Taft (1973) matched a group of creative 12 year olds with a control group of the same I.Q. and sex, and attending the same school, in order to identify the determining characteristics of the parents. They found that the majority of creative boys and girls had working mothers, the difference was significant for the girls, and that creative children were permitted more contact with out-of-home influences. The significant effect of mothers' employment status on their daughters' development has been reported by other investigators. Freeman (1971) reviewed these findings and concludes that over-socialization has deleterious effects for children, especially girls. If the mother works the daughter is less likely to be over-protected, and more likely to have a positive and active female model with which to identify. Baruch (1972) supports these conclusions. She found that girls with employed mothers were less prejudiced against women, associated competence with femininity and chose to identify with their mothers more than girls with non-working mothers. Once again, although the results do not provide us with a clear statement of child-rearing practices, they are suggestive.

Group Alternatives

The areas of research most directly related to the central concern of this paper are those investigating the effects of group

care. Swift (1964) reviewed the import of nursery school and day nursery (day care) attendance upon the young child, and summarized the global effects as follows: positive or no change in intellectual development, positive or no change in social development, no change in physical development, and no harmful effects on emotional adjustment. While these findings are inconclusive as to the extent of positive change attributable to the nursery experience they clearly show no negative effects. And special group programs designed for children considered to be disadvantaged or mentally retarded have been demonstrated to have especially strong positive effects on intellectual and language development (Swift, 1964).

Raph et. al. (1968) studied the effects of the age at school entrance and length of school attendance on social interactions of young children. The 97 Ss belonged to one of three groups: 2 year nursery school plus 1 year kindergarten; 1 year nursery school plus 1 year kindergarten; 1 year kindergarten. The groups did not differ in I.Q. or family socio-economic level. As the age of the children increased so did the total number of social interactions. It is interesting to note that although the total number of interactions increased the number of interactions with teachers decreased and their mood became increasingly negative. At the same time, peer interactions increased and became less negative. This suggests a difference in the children's interaction patterns due to group experience which we will discuss more fully later.

Several recent studies have been done to evaluate the effect of an experimental and innovative infant day care center associated with Syracuse University (for a description see Caldwell & Richmond, 1964). Caldwell et. al. (1970) evaluated the strength

of maternal attachment in day care versus home-reared 30 month olds. The groups consisted of 23 home-reared children and 18 children who had been in the Children's Center for a mean of 18.8 months. Interviews, home visits, and developmental tests were used to collect the data. No differences were found between the home and day care groups on any ratings of the child's relationship with his or her mother. Day care children showed more proximity-seeking of others then did home-reared children. Day care mothers tended to be more permissive. And, across groups, the better developed infants were more strongly attached to their mothers than the less well developed ones. This sample of children is one that the authors define as "disadvantaged". The Developmental Quotients of the home group were significantly higher than the day care group at 12 months but not at 30 months. The home group had decreased while the day care group increased slightly.

Schwarz et. al. (1973) assessed the effect of early day care experience at the Children's Center on social-emotional development by measuring reactions of early and late starting day care children to changes in child care arrangements. This is believed to be a sensitive measure of emotional security since strong emotional reactions have been shown to result from child care changes when insecure parent-child relationships exist (Read, 1971). The early group consisted of 20 children who had started day care at the mean age of 9.5 months and had, at the time of the study, been in day care for a mean of 36 months. The late group was matched in age, sex,

race, occupation and educational level of parents and were, at the time of the study, beginning their day care experience at a mean of 3 years 6 months of age. The children were all observed and rated on their first day at the new day care center and again 5 weeks later. The early group showed less tension, less signs of emotional insecurity, remained happier, and showed a higher level of peer interaction. Since most of these children had been Ss in the Caldwell et. al. (1970) study differences can not be attributable to lack of maternal attachment in the early group.

In another comparison of the early and late starting day care children Schwarz et. al. (1972) had each child rated on nine traits after they had been in the new day care center for 4 months. These traits fell into three categories: social compatibility, social assertiveness, and intellectual competency. Three months after the initial ratings the children were rated again. Results showed significant differences between the two groups on three of the nine traits. The early group were rated less cooperative with adults and less inclined to do what they were told than the late starting group. The early group was rated more physically and verbally aggressive with peers and adults. The early group was more active in their play than the late group. There were no differences in the two groups on any of the intellectual competency traits that were measured.

These studies of the effects of well planned group child care provide us with a consistent pattern of results. Cognitive development is either unaffected or positively affected by day care.

Emotional development is either no different or positively affected by day care. Social interactions show a different pattern for group care children than home-reared children: group children seek and enjoy social interactions more and at an earlier age, and as they age they interact more with peers than adults and the peer interactions are more positive while the adult-interactions are increasingly negative.

This pattern of social interaction appears to us to be a positive change as compared with home-reared children. It reflects less need for adult approval, more interdependence with peers, and a greater degree of self-reliance. These are all important traits for creative, non-conforming, critically-thinking adults. Data from several sources support the importance of peer relationships for social-emotional development. Harlow & Harlow (1969) have shown peer relationships to be more crucial than mother-child relationships to the development of normal social interactions in adulthood. Freud & Dann (1951) have reported that peer relationships could be cooperative and non-jealous and provide emotional security for infants in an extremely economically, culturally, and adult deprived environment. Schwarz (1972) has shown that a close friend could provide emotional security that could make being placed in a nonfamiliar environment a positive experience rather than an upsetting one. Lewis & Brooks-Gunn (1972) have shown that 7-0 month old home-reared infants show positive affect to unfamiliar children and negative affect to unfamiliar adults. Prete (1973) has shown that 11-18 month old day-care infants show positive affect to unfamiliar children and adults, as well as to familiar ones, when in a familiar environment.

This is not to suggest that we believe child-adult interactions should be negative or unimportant but rather that they are over-valued and peer relations under-valued for young children. In the context of a society in which adults are authorities and expect obedience rather than discussion and agreement, resistance on the part of children should be interpreted as a positive sign. It is likely that questions such as "Why should I?" or statements like "I'd rather do this" were considered negative interactions by the researchers. We see them as positive. They reflect a sense of integrity that is not usually demonstrated by a child whose life satisfactions are almost totally dependent upon mother agreeing and approving.

The development of this sense of self probably depends upon solid peer-relations and relationships with multiple adults. It is through a variety of social interactions that a child learns who he or she is and can be, instead of what mother expects him or her to be. For this reason we believe that age-integrated social interactions are necessary for young children. Children raised in a mutually dependent relationship with a single mother, where the child depends upon mother for satisfaction of all its needs and mother depends upon the child for her self-worth, are doomed by such emotional dependence to separation anxiety and dependency in adulthood. It is precisely the adolescent and adult psychiatric problems produced by nuclear-family child rearing which in turn are used to reinforce the stringent nuclear-family model. Deviance is attributed to lack of adherence to the model

rather than the inherent weaknesses in the model.

Given the overwhelming value placed upon individual mothering by the prevailing ideology, one might expect to find consistent evidence of its efficacy for healthy cognitive and social-emotional development. But despite the societal bias that directs the formulation of research problems and sets the context for how questions are answered and rating scales devised, the evidence does not exist. Unless a child is institutionalized, which often is accompanied by physical and/or psychological trauma, we find no consistent negative consequences resulting from non-nuclear child-rearing practices, and, in fact, find suggestions of positive consequences. When group care is high quality, as in the studies reported, the effects on the developing child are positive. This is not surprising since communal child rearing has a much longer history than does individual care in the nuclear family. The modern history of the family helps to explain the current prevalence of the nuclear model and the historic position of the child rearing institutions of our society.

Ainsworth, M. D. The effects of maternal deprivation: A review of findings and controversy in the context of research strategy. In Deprivation of Maternal Care, Public Health Papers, No. 14, Geneva: World Health Organization, 1962.

Bowlby, J. Maternal care and mental health. Monograph Series, No. 2, Geneva: World Health Organization, 1951.

Bronfenbrenner, V. Reaction to social pressure from adults versus peers among Soviet day school and boarding school pupils in theperspective of an American sample. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 179-189.

Caldwell, B. M. What is the optimal learning environment for the young child? Am. Journal of Orthopsychology, 1967, 37, 8-21.

Caldwell, B. M., Hersher, L., Lipton, E. L., Richmond, J. B., Stern, G. A., Eddy, E., Drachman, R., & Rothman, A. Mother-infant interactions in monomatric and polymatric families. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1963, 33, 653-664.

Caldwell, B., & Richmond, J. Programmed day care for the very young child: A preliminary report. Journal of Marriage and the family, 1964, 26, 481-488.

Caldwell, B. M., Wright, C. M., Honig, A. S., & Tannenbaum, J. Infant day care and attachment. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1970, 40, 397-412.

Dewing, K., & Taft, R. Some characteristics of the parents of creative twelve-year-olds. Journal of Personality, 1973, 41, 71-85.

Firestone, S. The dialectic of sex. New York: Bantam, 1970.

Freeman, J. The social construction of the second sex. In M. H. Garskof (Ed.), Roles women play. Belmont, Cal.: Brook/Cole, 1971, Pp. 123-141.

Freud, A., & Dann, S. An experiment in group upbringing. Psycholanalytic study of the child, 1951, 6, 127-168.

Gardner, D. B., Hawks, G. R., & Burchinal, L. G. Noncontinuous mothering in infancy and development in later childhood. Child Development, 1961, 32, 225-234.

Harlow, H. F., & Harlow, M. K. Effects of various mother-infant relationships on rhesus monkey behaviors. In B. M. Foss (Ed.) Determinants of infant behavior, Vol. IV. London: Metheun Press, 1969.

Lewis, M., & Brooks-Gunn, J. Self, other, and fear: The reaction of infants to people. Paper presented at the Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Boston, 1972.

Mead, M. A cultural anthropoligist's approach to maternal deprivation. In Deprivation of maternal care, Public Health Paper, No. 14, Geneva: World Health Organization, 1962.

Pease, D., & Gardner, D. B. Research on the effects of non-continuous mothering. Child Development, 1958, 29, 141-148.

Prete, E. The reaction of day care infants to familiar and unfamiliar people. Unpublished paper. 1973.

Raph, J. B., Thomas, A., Chess, S., & Korn, S. J. The influence of nursery school on social interaction. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1968, 38, 144-152.

Read, K. The nursery school: A human relationships laboratory. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1971.

Schwatz, J. C. Effects of peer familiarity on the behavior of pre-schoolers in a novel situation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 24, 276-284.

Schwarz, J. C., Krolick, G., & Strickland, R. G. Effects of early day care experience on adjustment to a new environment. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1973, 43, 340-346.

Schwarz, J. C., Strickland, R. G., & Krolick, G. A behavioral comparison of early and late starting day care children. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Boston, 1972.

Stolz, L. M. Effects of maternal employment on children: Evidence from research. Child Development, 1960, 31, 749-782.

Swift, J. Effects of early group experience: The nursery school and day nursery. Review of Child Development Research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964, 249-288.

Yarrow, L. J. Separation from parents during early childhood. Review of Child Development Research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964, 89-136.